DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 471 HE 020 375

AUTHOR Burke, Dolores L.
TITLE Disposable Goods or Valued Resource: Appointment and Termination of Assistant Professors. ASHE 1987 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Feb 87
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (San Diego, CA, February 14-17, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Rank (Professional); Affirmative Action; *College Faculty; *Employment Practices; Higher Education; Personnel Policy; Research Universities; *Teacher Dismissal; *Teacher Employment; Teacher Recruitment; Teacher Selection
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Assistant Professors; Resignation (Job)

ABSTRACT

The question of whether assistant professors are valued resources at colleges was investigated and compared to findings of a 1957 study by Caplow and McGee. Based on actual personnel actions, interviews were conducted with 306 department heads, nonterminated faculty colleagues, and new appointees. The interviews were concerned with the appointment in the 1984-85 academic year of 96 assistant professors at three private and three public research universities and the termination of 87 assistant professors at the same institutions at the end of the 1983-84 academic year. As in the Caplow and McGee study, attention is directed to: the recruitment process, origination of the position, the search for candidates and interviewing, the representation of women and minorities among appointees, faculty dismissal, resignation, and the impact of departure. It was found that there was little proportional difference in the "share" of appointments given to assistant professors between 1957 and 1985. Two important changes in the screening process were the careful attention paid to the candidates' written work and the weight given to the campus interview. One change from 1957 is the increased number of dismissed assistant professors who left the field of higher education. It is concluded that the determination as to whether assistant professors are valued resources or disposable grads remains open and will come ultimately from the academic department. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281471

DISPOSABLE GOODS OR VALUED RESOURCE: APPOINTMENT AND TERMINATION OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

Prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego, February 14-17, 1987.

By Dolores L. Burke
Special Assistant to the President
Duke University
Durham, NC 27706

HE 020 375

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dolores L. Burke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

The George Washington
University
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036-1183
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the San Diego Hilton in San Diego, California, February 14-17, 1987. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

DISPOSABLE GOODS OR VALUED RESOURCE: APPOINTMENT AND TERMINATION OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

In recent years, the management literature has indicated a growing interest in the individual member of the organization as an important contributor. The people of the successful nonacademic organization are generally considered to be a valued resource. There has been a gradual change over the past thirty years from an orientation of scientific management (people as replaceable parts) to the current mode of integration of the individual into the organization.

During those years of evolution, the environment of organizations in which higher education exists has changed in other ways as well. When Veblen[1] complained about commercial influences on the university in 1918, he was writing in an age of industrialization where manufacturing organizations dominated business patterns, as was still the case after World War II. Today's post-industrial environment has seen a pronounced shift from manufacturing to a service economy: the nonacademic business environment is more <u>like</u> the university. In fact, the corporate world has already infringed upon the academic in various forms of education and research, in some cases siphoning off Ph.D.'s who in earlier days would have become university professors.[2]

Another important change in the environment is the foreign competition for American business that has encouraged a "search for excellence" in American firms -- a search that includes an organization's human resources as a primary component of excellence. The search is echoed in the

comparable quest for higher status among universities competing with a greater number of similar institutions for human and financial resources.

Yet, in spite of the increased societal emphasis on the individual in the organization, as well as accelerated competition among institutions of higher education and between the academic and nonacademic sectors for human resources, there has been little research on human resource management in higher education. When James Bess summarized organization theory in higher education,[3] he found the area of human resource management to be very light, with no contemporary attention having been given to recruitment and placement. For a comprehensive study of the faculty personnel system, one is thrown back on Theodore Caplow and Reece McGee's classic investigation into faculty mobility.[4]

Caplow and McGee wrote about faculty personnel processes in an era when transition of thought about the people of an organization was just beginning, a time when individuals were more likely to be viewed as disposable goods. Have the ensuing years and societal changes affected those faculty personnel processes, as similar processes have been affected in nonacademic organizations? The purpose of this paper is to examine the recruitment and separation of assistant professors in an attempt to answer that question.

This paper is based on partial data from a broader study that is a replication of the Caplow and McGee study. The study is based in the arts and sciences department in the research university. "Research university" is the Caplow and McGee setting; it is the training ground for new faculty members as well as a principal employer, and as such establishes the norms for the profession. The arts and sciences unit of the university, again the

Caplow and McGee area of inquiry, is the heart of the university, traditionally and intellectually, and the sector where process is most likely to be shaped by shared values. "Assistant professor" is selected as the level of this portion of the study because the bulk of faculty personnel activity still occurs at the junior level, thus having the greatest impact on the personnel system. In this last point, there is no change from the Caplow and McGee study: the proportion of appointments and terminations at the assistant professor rank in their sample was 72.2 percent of the total; in the current sample the proportion is 73.7 percent.

Description of the Study

From the total of 306 interviews conducted between December 1985 and April 1986, this paper focuses on data collected about assistant professor appointments and terminations from 104 interviews with department chairmen, 46 interviews with colleagues ("peers") of departed faculty members, and 79 interviews with new appointees.[5] The sample is closely tailored to the earlier study: six research universities, three public and three private, from the group of nine used by Caplow and McGee. The academic departments included in this portion of the study are ranked according to faculty quality[6] from one to fifty, with about three-fourths of the total ranked departments in the top twenty.

The interviews are based on actual personnel actions and in this case are concerned with the appointment in the 1984-85 academic year of ninety-six assistant professors and the termination at the end of the 1983-84 academic year of eighty-seven assistant professors, divided fairly evenly among the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, and between the public and private institutions; there is a slight shift of appointment

activity to the natural sciences and somewhat heavier overall activity in the public institutions. The interview schedule used for the replication was the original instrument, with slight modifications made with Professor McGee's assistance. The questions asked were open-ended and generally expected to elicit individual comments rather than highly structured responses. The following overview of selected portions of the research, divided into the categories of recruitment and separation, is drawn from the interview data.

Recruitment

The recruitment process is viewed in several segments: the origination of the position, the search for candidates, the selection of the successful candidate, and the negotiation of an employment contract. As an introduction to findings of change or lack of change in the process, a comparison is made between the Caplow and McGee data and the current data for the six universities studied. The total numbers are greater; there is little proportional difference.

	Appointment of Assistant Professors	
	1958 Study	Current Study
Total Number	66	96
Percent of all appointments	72.5	70.1

Origination of the Position

Caplow and McGee referred to an assumption about budget lines, or "slots," and a vacancy-and-replacement attitude that had a faculty departure triggering a faculty replacement at the same rank within the same department, almost automatically. In this study, the academic department was not given a replacement position automatically but was required to

request authorization from the dean. Infrequently, the opening was initiated by a dean or provost -- for example, an incoming senior professor was accommodated by giving the department additional junior positions, or a need in an interdisciplinary program was assigned to a particular department. In these cases, however, it is important to note that the recruiting process remained the responsibility of the department.

Prior to a request for authorization the position was given some degree of definition by the recruiting department. Generally, position definition was achieved through a democratic process within the department, although there were some instances of a chairman acting alone.

The Search

Caplow and McGee remarked that the most striking feature of academic hiring procedures was the time and effort that most departments devoted to appointments. "The average salary of an assistant professor is approximately that of a bakery truck driver, and his occupancy of a job is likely to be less permanent," they said. But it may take a large part of the time of several highly skilled people for a long period of time to hire him![7] That has not changed. The search process is still extremely time-consuming, but it is viewed by department members as an essential part of their job.

A change has occurred, however, at the initiation of the search. Junior faculty recruitment in the 1980s, with few exceptions, begins with advertising; the search is public knowledge. Each department surveyed began its search by preparing and placing an advertisement in a professional journal customarily read by job-seekers in the discipline. There was a

difference in opinion among chairmen as to whether advertising had begun because of affirmative action requirements or as a result of strain on the "network" system of hiring caused by the expansion of higher education in the 1960s. Professional journals queried on the subject indicated publication of advertisements for faculty positions before 1972, when employment law was clarified to include coverage of professionals. But whether a result of an expanding need or equal employment opportunity regulation, open advertising of junior positions has become the rule.

Broad communication of information about fewer openings generates large applicant pools at the junior level. In Caplow and McGee's 1950s the majority of positions filled had ten or fewer candidates. In the 1980s the situation is far different. For example, the sociology search for three assistant professors described by Smelser and Content[8] netted 285 candidates. In this study, two-thirds of the departments typically attracted more than fifty applications for an assistant professor opening, and over a third attracted more than a hundred applications.

Academic departments have devised efficient ways of dealing with the large applicant flow. Recruitment committees are used, as was the case in the 1950s, but the procedures followed by the committees are more routinized than in the earlier study, where recruiting was more a matter of finding candidates than of sorting out those who applied. Nevertheless, the criteria actually applied to searching and screening do not differ from those described by Caplow and McGee. For example, personal contacts with colleagues at other institutions are still quite important, along with letters of recommendation in which the identity of the writer counts as much as content. One change noted in the current study is a consistent <u>reading</u>

of the candidate's written work; Caplow and McGee identified several instances where written materials, although enumerated as part of the criteria, were not actually read by anyone in the department.

The Selection

Looking at the later stage of the recruitment process, one finds at the outset a difference from the 1950s. Less than half of the assistant professors in Caplow and McGee's sample were interviewed prior to being hired. In the current study, there was general agreement that the interview was the pinnacle of the upward climb for the junior faculty candidate -- the place where the candidate could perform brilliantly or self-destruct. In four departments in the sample, interviews were conducted only at professional meetings; in three other departments, the campus visit was relatively undemanding. But for the large majority of the new appointees, the job search culminated in an experience described by one chairman as "grueling" and by an assistant professor as "intensive."

The routine was fairly standard across the departments surveyed, and activity fell roughly into three categories: group professional, individual professional, and semi-social. The group professional activity, viewed by many as the most important, was a presentation -- or in some cases two presentations, one informal to faculty members and graduate students with research interests similar to those of the candidate and a more formal presentation to a larger group that might include members of other departments. The job talk, as it is called in several disciplines, was seen as an indication of classroom performance as well as the candidate's ability to communicate research results. Individual professional meetings were arranged in different ways: "office hours" held by the candidate, a

prearranged appointment schedule developed from faculty and graduate student signup sheets, or less formal meetings made possible by size in smaller departments. The individual meeting was often an acclimatizing occasion; as one chairman commented, "We tell them what life is like here." The semi-social category includes meals, receptions, and other "personal time"; it is important to get to know the candidates when choosing a colleague.

Yet, the basis of choice was rarely described in personal terms by the chairmen interviewed. Quality of research, the dissertation, and especially the presentation -- style, competence, substance -- were important factors. There was frequent mention of the presentation displaying a potential for teaching, but it was clear that for teaching, in one respondent's words, "the top fifty percent is okay, but we want the top one percent in research."

The theory of doctoral prestige,[9] first posited by Caplow and McGee based on their 1955-57 sample and confirmed in the literature since then, is generally supported in the current study. Caplow and McGee had contended that because of the role played by prestige in the academic labor market, although faculty hiring was viewed as open, or competitive, in reality it was closed, or preferential. This condition continues, although with some tempering. The majority of the appointees of the ten top-ranked departments came from the ten top-ranked departments -- although a surprising 20 percent did not. Not surprisingly, about 60 percent of the appointees in departments ranked below the top ten came from the ten top-ranked departments.[10]

As in the Caplow and McGee data, the match of department and appointee appeared good. Most departments reported appointing their first choice;

only six new appointees admitted that the job was not their first choice. About half the sample reported rejecting other job offers. As to reasons for job choice, most frequently mentioned by the new appointees was the individual's professional opportunities, that is, compatibility of research interests with the strengths of the department and flexibility in teaching to permit expression of personal research interests.[11] Interestingly, when asked why they thought the new junior faculty member had accepted the job, the reason most frequently given by chairmen was the prestige of the department; research interests were considered a factor but further down the list.

The attitude toward the new assistant professor has changed significantly since the 1950s. Caplow and McGee found that only 33 percent of newly appointed junior faculty members were expected by chairmen to have a long-term effect on the department. In sharp contrast in this study, 83 percent of the junior appointments were expected to have a long-run effect on the department. Several of the negative or neutral responses involved environmental factors beyond the department's and the new appointee's control, such as structural reorganization, space limitations, and equipment problems.

Offer and Acceptance

The end of the recruiting story is much like the beginning, with a participatory process within the academic department, basically similar to but more democratic than that reported by Caplow and McGee. In their sample, all members of the department participated in the hiring process in only 31 percent of the hiring departments and the chairman exercised sole

authority in 13 percent of the departments. In this study, the full faculty participated, usually by vote, in 82 percent of the hiring decisions; faculty committees accounted for the remaining 18 percent.

The actual offer required administrative approval, as in the Caplow and McGee study. In a departure from the 1950s, however, at one public and one private institution in the current sample, requests to make an appointment at the assistant professor level were referred to central faculty committees for review; no rejections were reported, but the intervention was viewed as a nuisance by the department.[12]

About half of the junior appointees negotiated the terms of their employment contracts, as compared to a much lower incidence across ranks in the Caplow and McGee study. (Negotiation occurred in all senior appointments in the current study.)

Affirmative Action

Bias was a concern of Caplow and McGee[13]; but their book was published several years before Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and before President Johnson signed Executive Order 11246 in 1965. This study, involving hiring decisions made almost three decades later, shows considerable change in the representation of women and minorities:

	Assistant Professor Appointments	
	1958 Study	Current Study
Total	66	96
White Male	63	62
White Female	3*	26
Minority Male	-	4
Minority Female	-	4

*Hired in speech and home economics

A continuing change projected by chairmen for the supply side of the market was a greater participation of women (although no one was sanguine about black or Hispanic increases in the foreseeable future).

To summarize change and lack of change in the recruitment process: There is little proportional difference in the "share" of appointments given to assistant professors; the total number of appointments in the current study is about 50 percent greater than the 1955-57 volume. The administration plays a stronger role in the origination of a position, but the recruitment process itself is still the responsibility of the academic department. Public advertising of positions is a change in procedure at the onset of a search; it contributes to much larger applicant pools than existed in the 1950s and has resulted in codification of the process across institutions and disciplines.

The openness of the initial process appears to have little effect on the actual screening and selection, where prestige remains an important factor (both as to doctorate and recommenders). But two important changes in the screening process are the careful attention paid to the candidates' written work and the weight given to the campus interview by the department members. A further change to be noted is the greater expectation of the new appointee's impact on the department. Participation in the academic labor market has been modified to include an increased number of women and minorities among appointments. Finally, a change is seen in the agreement between the appointing department and the appointee as to the importance of research in selection and evaluation.

Separation

Terminations of assistant professors, at 52 percent of all terminations in the current study, make up a slightly larger proportion than the 48 percent noted by Caplow and McGee (owing partly to the greater incidence of death among senior professors in the earlier sample). Of greater interest is the similarity of the breakdown within the group, particularly in dismissal and resignation:

	Assistant Professor Departures			
	1958 Study		Current Study	
	No.	%	No.	%
Dismissal	33	47.8	43	49.4
Resignation	34	49.3	41	47.1
Retirement	1	1.4	2	2.3
Death	1	1.4	1	1.1
Total	69	100.0	87	100.0

Dismissal

Dismissal of the assistant professor, that is, denial of tenure or denial of reappointment prior to tenure consideration, accounts for half of the terminations and could be an important indicator of the effectiveness of the selection process. If one assumes a fairly constant rate of appointment since 1978 (the date when most of these departing assistant professors were appointed) and compare the incidence of dismissal (43) with the incidence of junior appointment in the sample (97), it can be suggested that the selection process is not a good predictor of success on the job. Even allowing for a greater number of appointments in 1978, say 150, the failure rate shakes one's confidence in the system. What went wrong? An examination of the cases of dismissal may provide some clues.

First, an initial complication may occur in the tenuring process by the split responsibility, between the academic department and a central faculty

committee that is advisory to the provost (and usually controlling). In the dismissals in this study, however, the denial decision occurred at the department level in a majority of the cases -- about two-thirds, as compared to about three-fourths in the Caplow and McGee data. It can be observed in the current sample that the congruence between departmental and institutional standards lessened as the ranked quality of the department decreased. A third of the decisions about assistant professors from the lowest ranked departments and only an eighth of the decisions about assistant professors from the highest ranked departments were made by the central committee.

	Number of Tenure Decisions		
	Total	By Department	By Central Committee
Department Ranking*:			
1 to 5	-	-	-
6 to 10	8	7	1
11 to 20	15	11	4
Below 20	12	8	4

*8 dismissals in departments not ranked

Second, where the denial of tenure or reappointment occurred at the department level, and although candidate and department agreed on the importance of research at the outset, there may have been a divergence of interest on the new assistant professor's part as time passed after appointment. Another factor here may have been the departmental environment -- the degree of "nurturing" of the junior faculty member.

Third, the assistant professor may have failed to deliver on the promise of colleagueship, either on a professional or on a personal level, as indicated anecdotally by comments on "split votes" or "inappropriate

behavior." Again, the departmental environment may have played a role.

Finally, the standards may have changed between the time of appointment and the time of tenure consideration. Elevation of standards reflects the quest for status in which many departments are engaged -- "We are targeting being in the top five." This may be an elusive goal in view of the fact that in the three disciplines represented in personnel activity in all of the institutions studied, the same ten departments had occupied the top ten positions in 1970 and 1982 rankings.[14]

An interesting revelation in these data is that the departments ranked in the top ten accounted for only eight of the dismissals, and there were none among the top five. This suggests that the highly subjective final stage of the selection process works best in the top quality departments. In other words, the success of the candidate may be linked to the departmental environment in which he or she works.

Resignation

By far the most frequent reasons given by a close colleague for the resignation of an assistant professor, whether or not tenure apprehensions were present, were intellectual isolation and intellectual incompatibility with senior colleagues. Among other suspected reasons for leaving, money was mentioned as a primary motivation in only two cases[15]; the more typical comment was, "They didn't offer him much more in the way of money, but he thought he would be more appreciated there." In these respects the data do not differ from those of Caplow and McGee.

Another frequently mentioned element in the voluntary resignation of assistant professors was spouse employment: the spouse (of either sex) who

could not find a good job, the new spouse who was somewhere else, or the dual-career academic couple who found a better situation. Although career interests of the wives of faculty members were mentioned occasionally in the Caplow and McGee data, there was not the pattern that emerged in the current study, nor were both sexes on the faculty affected.

Efforts were made by the department to retain the resigning assistant professors in about a third of the cases -- for fourteen out of the forty-one assistant professors -- roughly equivalent to the percentage found by Caplow and McGee. The efforts consisted predominantly of salary counteroffers, as in the earlier study; but a device new to this study was a leave arrangement for the first year at another school. The latter, judging from the total sample including new appointees, was an effort commonly made to maintain a tie to the department in the hope that the faculty member would decide to return.

Destination

Where did these departing junior faculty members go? To diverse places, but the drift was decidedly downward to lower-ranked departments, as had been noted by Caplow and McGee in their sample. (This is no longer consistently true at the senior level.) Also as noted by Caplow and McGee, the move "down" could include a promotion "up": 32 percent of those who moved voluntarily and 30 percent of those who were denied tenure were promoted to associate professor in their new job. A significant difference in the data from the two studies is seen in the proportion of dismissed assistant professors who left higher education

	Percent Leaving Higher Education	
	1958 Study	Current Study
Assistant Professors - dismissed	27.3	39.5
Assistant Professors - resigned	23.5	24.4

Impact of Departure

When well educated, experienced professionals leave an organization, it would be expected that their loss would be felt. Caplow and McGee expressed surprise that this was not the case in their sample and commented further that the careful scrutiny of candidates for a faculty position and the complicated process of search and appointment implied a uniqueness to the appointee that was belied by the lack of impact of a departure on the department.[17] There was no effect in more than 60 percent of the cases in their sample, across ranks, and in 84 percent of the assistant professor departures. The proportion is different in the current sample, with no effect reported in 51 percent of the total and 63 percent of the assistant professor departures.

Reasons for a departure having an effect or not having an effect were consistently expressed by chairmen and do not differ substantially from the earlier data. Departures of junior faculty members had no effect on the department because the assistant professors who left were not successful in research, never had many students, had not been there long enough to make a difference, were not in the mainstream of the department's interests, were in a large department where one person did not matter much, or had been replaced satisfactorily (not necessarily a direct replacement). On the other hand, the reasons for the departure of an assistant professor having

an effect on the department were that it was difficult to find people in their particular fields, they were exceptionally good teachers, their area was left uncovered, it was a loss to the department's research effort, it was a small department and the loss of one person was felt, or the department lost the position.

To sum up change and absence of change in the separation process: Assistant professor terminations make up a somewhat higher proportion of all terminations; however, the proportions of dismissal and resignation within the assistant professor group have changed very little. A higher percentage of tenure denials are made by central committees than occurred in the earlier sample, but the majority of tenure decisions are made at the departmental level as in the Caplow and McGee study. Assistant professors resign for the same reasons as in the 1950s, and salary is far down the list as a motivator (although high on the list of incentives offered to remain). Leaves of absence are frequently arranged for resigning assistant professors, unremarked in the Caplow and McGee data. A significant change in the current academic marketplace is the difficulty of spouse employment, whether academic or nonacademic and of either sex.

When assistant professors leave, they move "down" in prestige of department, but often "up" in rank and tenure status, as was also the case in the earlier study. A pronounced change is in the increased number of dismissed assistant professors who left higher education altogether.

There has been a change from Caplow and McGee's findings on the impact a departing faculty member had on the department, but the departure of an

assistant professor still has no effect in about two-thirds of the cases (a marked change, however, from the more than four-fifths they reported).

Discussion and Conclusions

The objective of this paper has been to assess the change in the faculty personnel system since Caplow and McGee collected their data in 1957 and to present the change in a framework of the contemporary human resource management principle of people as a valued resource. The data on assistant professors used for this assessment can be considered on three levels: (1) Indicators of treatment as a valued resource across samples; (2) indicators of a "disposable goods" or "replaceable parts" approach across samples; and (3) indicators of a change from sample to sample in either direction.

(1) Valued resource, then and now. Caplow and McGee were cognizant of the importance of recruitment to the university, and said, " . . . the analysis of hiring procedures may clarify our general view of the values held in the academic profession."[18] The data on the recruitment process in both studies clearly show a concern with those values as they affect evaluation of the individual being selected. Recruitment was and is undertaken with great care -- facilitated somewhat in the later sample by the current market structure and recruitment mechanisms through which candidates are more easily identified. Academic departments view recruitment as an important part of the faculty job -- quoting one chairman, "Faculty recruiting is a consuming, gut-wrenching task. But we've done an effective job . . . [because] the department is willing to put the resources into it." Although the authorization for a faculty position is now likely to be negotiated with the dean, the recruitment process itself continues to

rely upon the qualitative judgment of the members of the department who are choosing the new colleague -- and the decision is participatory, involving more department members than was the case in the earlier study.

The prestige factor still dominates the faculty recruitment system. The criteria applied to screening and selection do not vary substantially across studies, and form a continuing pattern of a "fine sifting" process.[19] The application of the criteria is even more comprehensive in the 1980s in the close reading of a candidate's work and the importance of the campus interview.

(2) Disposable goods, then and now. In both studies, dismissals reflected a failure rate that would appear to be quite high for a carefully selected group. Further, there is reason to suspect that departmental environment is a strong contributing factor in the failure to achieve reappointment or tenure. Negative environmental factors may be exacerbated by the new desire for "higher ratings" producing barriers rather than encouraging development toward academic success.

Not a great deal of interest was shown in either study in retaining assistant professors who resigned -- they were apparently replaceable parts. Nor did a faculty member's departure have much effect, although there was a greater degree registered in the later study. Both of these points are difficult to understand in view of the significance that had been attached to the faculty member's appointment.

(3) Effects of change. There are three changes that would appear to support the "valued resource" theory. The first of these is the chairman's evaluation of the long-range importance of the appointee to the department. The heightened expectation for the new faculty member's contribution is a

startling departure from the attitudes of the 1950s, and is possibly the strongest change indicator of the new importance of the individual to the organization. (Unfortunately, it may be partially negated by the argument in (2) above.) The second change is in the negotiation of the employment contract. That negotiation is entertained at all in the current market is also a strong change indicator, even though the incidence is not high. Third, the acceptance of the philosophy of affirmative action, or rather, equal opportunity,[20] confirms the worth of the individual.

A fourth change, the issue of spouse employment, is generally neutral. But where the issue is thoughtfully confronted and accommodation is achieved or attempted, it would appear to lend strength to the "valued resource" argument.

TO CONCLUDE: Is the assistant professor disposable goods or a valued resource? As is the case with most either-or questions, the answer may lie somewhere in between. There are certainly indications that higher education was ahead of the nonacademic sector in the 1950s in its careful recruitment procedures and the participatory environment, which have been continued and intensified. The prestige system served and serves a useful purpose in reducing the uncertainty inherent in a professional appointment, in effect contributing to the perception of the new assistant professor as a valued resource. Additionally, while these positive features have been retained, assessment of the initial worth of a junior appointee seems to have become more positive.

On the other hand, dismissals of these professionals are situations containing paradox. Why does the valued resource not make the grade? How much of the fault lies within the system rather than within the individual?

Higher education surely lags behind the increasingly professional nonacademic sector in addressing the development of its human resources.

Caplow and McGee struck upon an intuitive truth in identifying the nerve center of the academic organization by saying: "The process by which a department replaces its members and maintains its immortality is as nearly central to an understanding of academic institutions as anything can be."[21] The determination as to whether assistant professors are disposable goods or valued resources will come ultimately from the academic department.[22] Useful research following this study would be further investigation of the faculty personnel system at the departmental level of the research university, especially with respect to the integration of the new assistant professor into the intellectual life of the department.

NOTES

1. Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men (Stanford: Academic Reprints, 1954).

2. See, for example, discussion in Howard R. Bowen and Jack H. Schuster, American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled (New York: Oxford, 1986), 176-179.

3. James L. Bess, "Maps and Gaps in the Study of College and University Organization," The Review of Higher Education 6 (Summer 1983): 239-251.

4. Theodore Caplow and Reece J. McGee, The Academic Marketplace (New York: Basic Books, 1958).

5. This differs from the Caplow and McGee format, where new appointees themselves were not interviewed.

6. Lyle V. Jones, Gardner Lindzey, and Porter E. Coggleshall, eds., An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1982). Note that twenty-six departments (out of 104) covered in the study are in disciplines not ranked by the Jones et al. national survey.

7. Marketplace, 114.

8. Neil J. Smelser and Robin Content, The Changing Academic Market (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), chapter 7.

9. The phrase "theory of doctoral prestige" refers to the inference that the status of the department where one acquires the doctorate is a predictor of the status of the department in which one will be employed. The theory has been tested in various academic disciplines by a number of researchers, including Diana Crane, "The Academic Marketplace Revisited: A Study of Faculty Mobility Using the Cartter Ratings," American Journal of Sociology 75 (May 1970): 953-964; Lowell L. Hargens and Warren O. Hagstrom, "Sponsored and Contest Mobility of American Academic Scientists," Sociology of Education 40 (Winter 1967): 24-38; J. Scott Long, Paul D. Allison, and Robert McGinnis, "Entrance into the Academic Career," American Sociological Review 44 (October 1979): 816-830; and Fred Thompson and William Zumeta, "Hiring Decisions in Organized Anarchies: More Evidence on Entrance into the Academic Career," The Review of Higher Education 8 (Winter 1985): 123-138.

10. For explanations of this trickle-down effect, see William J. Moore, Robert J. Newman, John Raisan, and R. William Thomas, "A Quality-Adjustment Model of the Academic Labor Market: The Case of Economists," Economic Inquiry 21 (April 1983): 241-254; John A. Muffo and John R. Robinson, "Early Science Career Patterns of Recent Graduates from Leading Research Universities," The Review of Higher Education 5 (Fall 1981): 1-13; and Ted Il Koo Youn, "The Careers of Young Ph.D.'s: Temporal Change and Institutional Effects" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1981).

11. See Marketplace, 81-93. Caplow and McGee identified confusion about the faculty member's role growing out of the conflict between the task for which the faculty member is hired (teaching) and the activity upon which the faculty member is evaluated (research). In today's research university there seems to be no ambiguity: research is predominant in the requirements of the academic department and of the job candidate.

12. Caplow and McGee thought this an ineffective method: "Our data seem to suggest that the development of new committees and functionaries to diffuse the responsibility for appointments is almost wholly undesirable." Marketplace, 250.

13. See Marketplace, 226. "Women scholars are not taken seriously and cannot look forward to a normal professional career. . . . Discrimination on the basis of race appears to be nearly absolute."

14. The disciplines were economics, English, and physics, and the top ten departments in 1970 and 1982 were, listed alphabetically, the following: Economics - Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, MIT, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Stanford, Yale; English - Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Johns-Hopkins, Princeton, Stanford, Virginia, Yale; Physics - Berkeley, Caltech, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Illinois, MIT, Princeton, Stanford. The source of the 1970 ratings is Kenneth D. Roose and Charles J. Anderson, A Rating of Graduate Programs (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1970); see note 6 for the 1982 citation.

15. A number of researchers have contended that salary is not an important reason for academic mobility. See especially David G. Brown, The Mobile Professors (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1967).

16. This increase was predicted in Allan M. Cartter, Ph.D.'s and the Academic Labor Market (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), 171.

17. Marketplace, 102.

18. Marketplace, 109.

19. The "fine sifting" concept is described in David D. Dill, "Theory Versus Practice in the Staffing of R&D Laboratories," R&D Management 15 (July 1985): 227-241. Personal contacts and personal interviews are used in the recruiting process for research professionals in much the same way as they are used in the recruiting process for faculty members.

20. The prestige factor applies in all cases. For example, one black professor remarked, "There are unlimited opportunities for good blacks if they go to the right schools."

21. Marketplace, 28.

22. Cf. the contention that professionals are more likely to identify with a "local clan" (e.g., academic department) rather than an overall organization in Alan L. Wilkins and William G. Ouchi, "Efficient Cultures: Exploring the Relationship between Culture and Organizational Performance," Administrative Science Quarterly 28 (September 1983): 468-481.